



[7590-01-P]

**NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSIONRRC-2014-0095]**

**Biweekly Notice**

**Applications and Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses and Combined Licenses  
Involving No Significant Hazards Considerations**

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Biweekly notice.

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to Section 189a. (2) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is publishing this regular biweekly notice. The Act requires the Commission to publish notice of any amendments issued, or proposed to be issued and grants the Commission the authority to issue and make immediately effective any amendment to an operating license or combined license, as applicable, upon a determination by the Commission that such amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, notwithstanding the pendency before the Commission of a request for a hearing from any person.

This biweekly notice includes all notices of amendments issued, or proposed to be issued from April 3, 2014 to April 16, 2014. The last biweekly notice was published on April 15, 2014.

**DATES:** Comments must be filed by **[INSERT DATE 30 DAYS AFTER DATE OF PUBLICATION IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER]**. A request for a hearing must be filed by **[INSERT DATE 60 DAYS AFTER DATE OF PUBLICATION IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER]**.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments by any of the following methods (unless this document describes a different method for submitting comments on a specific subject):

- **Federal Rulemaking Web Site:** Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID **NRC-2014-0095**. Address questions about NRC dockets to Carol Gallagher; telephone: 301-287-3422; e-mail: [Carol.Gallagher@nrc.gov](mailto:Carol.Gallagher@nrc.gov).

- **Mail comments to:** Cindy Bladey, Office of Administration, Mail Stop: 3WFN-06-44M, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001.

For additional direction on accessing information and submitting comments, see “Accessing Information and Submitting Comments” in the SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION section of this document.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Beverly A. Clayton, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington DC 20555-0001; telephone: 301-415-3475, e-mail: [Beverly.Clayton@nrc.gov](mailto:Beverly.Clayton@nrc.gov).

## **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

### **I. Accessing Information and Submitting Comments.**

#### **A. Accessing Information.**

Please refer to Docket ID **NRC-2014-0095** when contacting the NRC about the availability of information regarding this document. You may access publicly-available information related to this document by any of the following methods:

- **Federal Rulemaking Web Site:** Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID **NRC-2014-0095**.

- **NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS):**  
You may access publicly available documents online in the ADAMS Public Documents collection at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. To begin the search, select "[ADAMS Public Documents](#)" and then select "[Begin Web-based ADAMS Search](#)." For problems with ADAMS, please contact the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR) reference staff at 1-800-397-4209, 301-415-4737, or by e-mail to [pdr.resource@nrc.gov](mailto:pdr.resource@nrc.gov). Documents may be viewed in ADAMS by performing a search on the document date and docket number.

- **NRC's PDR:** You may examine and purchase copies of public documents at the NRC's PDR, Room O1-F21, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852.

#### B. Submitting Comments.

Please include Docket ID **NRC-2014-0095** in the subject line of your comment submission, in order to ensure that the NRC is able to make your comment submission available to the public in this docket.

The NRC cautions you not to include identifying or contact information that you do not want to be publicly disclosed in your comment submission. The NRC will post all comment submissions at <http://www.regulations.gov> as well as enter the comment submissions into ADAMS. The NRC does not routinely edit comment submissions to remove identifying or contact information.

If you are requesting or aggregating comments from other persons for submission to the NRC, then you should inform those persons not to include identifying or contact information that

they do not want to be publicly disclosed in their comment submission. Your request should state that the NRC does not routinely edit comment submissions to remove such information before making the comment submissions available to the public or entering the comment submissions into ADAMS.

**II. Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility  
Operating Licenses and Combined Licenses and Proposed No  
Significant Hazards Consideration Determination.**

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the following amendment requests involve no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in § 50.92 of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated, or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The basis for this proposed determination for each amendment request is shown below.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of 60 days after the date of publication of this notice. The Commission may issue the license amendment before expiration of the 60-day period provided that its final determination is that the

amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. In addition, the Commission may issue the amendment prior to the expiration of the 30-day comment period should circumstances change during the 30-day comment period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example in derating or shutdown of the facility. Should the Commission take action prior to the expiration of either the comment period or the notice period, it will publish in the *Federal Register* a notice of issuance. Should the Commission make a final No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, any hearing will take place after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

**A. Opportunity to Request a Hearing and Petition for Leave to Intervene.**

Within 60 days after the date of publication of this notice, any person(s) whose interest may be affected by this action may file a request for a hearing and a petition to intervene with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license or combined license. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "Agency Rules of Practice and Procedure" in 10 CFR part 2. Interested person(s) should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.309, which is available at the NRC's PDR, located at One White Flint North, Room O1-F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland 20852. The NRC's regulations are accessible electronically from the NRC Library on the NRC's Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/cfr/>. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or a presiding officer designated by the Commission or by the Chief Administrative Judge of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the

Secretary or the Chief Administrative Judge of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of a hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.309, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following general requirements: 1) the name, address, and telephone number of the requestor or petitioner; 2) the nature of the requestor's/petitioner's right under the Act to be made a party to the proceeding; 3) the nature and extent of the requestor's/petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and 4) the possible effect of any decision or order which may be entered in the proceeding on the requestor's/petitioner's interest. The petition must also identify the specific contentions which the requestor/petitioner seeks to have litigated at the proceeding.

Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the requestor/petitioner shall provide a brief explanation of the bases for the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the requestor/petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The requestor/petitioner must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the requestor/petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. The petition must include sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the requestor/petitioner to relief. A requestor/petitioner who fails to satisfy these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene, and have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing.

If a hearing is requested, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will serve to decide when the hearing is held. If the final determination is that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendment and make it immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendment. If the final determination is that the amendment request involves a significant hazards consideration, then any hearing held would take place before the issuance of any amendment.

#### **B. Electronic Submissions (E-Filing).**

All documents filed in NRC adjudicatory proceedings, including a request for hearing, a petition for leave to intervene, any motion or other document filed in the proceeding prior to the submission of a request for hearing or petition to intervene, and documents filed by interested governmental entities participating under 10 CFR 2.315(c), must be filed in accordance with the NRC's E-Filing rule (72 FR 49139; August 28, 2007). The E-Filing process requires participants to submit and serve all adjudicatory documents over the internet, or in some cases to mail copies on electronic storage media. Participants may not submit paper copies of their filings unless they seek an exemption in accordance with the procedures described below.

To comply with the procedural requirements of E-Filing, at least ten 10 days prior to the filing deadline, the participant should contact the Office of the Secretary by e-mail at

[hearing.docket@nrc.gov](mailto:hearing.docket@nrc.gov), or by telephone at 301-415-1677, to request (1) a digital identification (ID) certificate, which allows the participant (or its counsel or representative) to digitally sign documents and access the E-Submittal server for any proceeding in which it is participating; and (2) advise the Secretary that the participant will be submitting a request or petition for hearing (even in instances in which the participant, or its counsel or representative, already holds an NRC-issued digital ID certificate). Based upon this information, the Secretary will establish an electronic docket for the hearing in this proceeding if the Secretary has not already established an electronic docket.

Information about applying for a digital ID certificate is available on the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals/getting-started.html>. System requirements for accessing the E-Submittal server are detailed in the NRC's "Guidance for Electronic Submission," which is available on the agency's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>. Participants may attempt to use other software not listed on the Web site, but should note that the NRC's E-Filing system does not support unlisted software, and the NRC Meta System Help Desk will not be able to offer assistance in using unlisted software.

If a participant is electronically submitting a document to the NRC in accordance with the E-Filing rule, the participant must file the document using the NRC's online, Web-based submission form. In order to serve documents through the Electronic Information Exchange System, users will be required to install a Web browser plug-in from the NRC's Web site. Further information on the Web-based submission form, including the installation of the Web browser plug-in, is available on the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>.

Once a participant has obtained a digital ID certificate and a docket has been created, the participant can then submit a request for hearing or petition for leave to intervene.



Submissions should be in Portable Document Format (PDF) in accordance with NRC guidance available on the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>. A filing is considered complete at the time the documents are submitted through the NRC's E-Filing system. To be timely, an electronic filing must be submitted to the E-Filing system no later than 11:59 p.m. Eastern Time on the due date. Upon receipt of a transmission, the E-Filing system time-stamps the document and sends the submitter an e-mail notice confirming receipt of the document. The E-Filing system also distributes an e-mail notice that provides access to the document to the NRC's Office of the General Counsel and any others who have advised the Office of the Secretary that they wish to participate in the proceeding, so that the filer need not serve the documents on those participants separately. Therefore, applicants and other participants (or their counsel or representative) must apply for and receive a digital ID certificate before a hearing request/petition to intervene is filed so that they can obtain access to the document via the E-Filing system.

A person filing electronically using the NRC's adjudicatory E-Filing system may seek assistance by contacting the NRC Meta System Help Desk through the "Contact Us" link located on the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>, by e-mail to [MSHD.Resource@nrc.gov](mailto:MSHD.Resource@nrc.gov), or by a toll-free call at 1-866-672-7640. The NRC Meta System Help Desk is available between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern Time, Monday through Friday, excluding government holidays.

Participants who believe that they have a good cause for not submitting documents electronically must file an exemption request, in accordance with 10 CFR 2.302(g), with their initial paper filing requesting authorization to continue to submit documents in paper format. Such filings must be submitted by: (1) first class mail addressed to the Office of the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001,

Attention: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff; or (2) courier, express mail, or expedited delivery service to the Office of the Secretary, Sixteenth Floor, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, 20852, Attention: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff. Participants filing a document in this manner are responsible for serving the document on all other participants. Filing is considered complete by first-class mail as of the time of deposit in the mail, or by courier, express mail, or expedited delivery service upon depositing the document with the provider of the service. A presiding officer, having granted an exemption request from using E-Filing, may require a participant or party to use E-Filing if the presiding officer subsequently determines that the reason for granting the exemption from use of E-Filing no longer exists.

Documents submitted in adjudicatory proceedings will appear in the NRC's electronic hearing docket which is available to the public at <http://ehd1.nrc.gov/ehd/>, unless excluded pursuant to an order of the Commission, or the presiding officer. Participants are requested not to include personal privacy information, such as social security numbers, home addresses, or home phone numbers in their filings, unless an NRC regulation or other law requires submission of such information. However, a request to intervene will require including information on local residence in order to demonstrate a proximity assertion of interest in the proceeding. With respect to copyrighted works, except for limited excerpts that serve the purpose of the adjudicatory filings and would constitute a Fair Use application, participants are requested not to include copyrighted materials in their submission.

Petitions for leave to intervene must be filed no later than 60 days from the date of publication of this notice. Requests for hearing, petitions for leave to intervene, and motions for leave to file new or amended contentions that are filed after the 60-day deadline will not be

entertained absent a determination by the presiding officer that the filing demonstrates good cause by satisfying the three factors in 10 CFR 2.309(c)(1)(i)-(iii).

For further details with respect to these license amendment applications, see the application for amendment which is available for public inspection in ADAMS and at the NRC's PDR. For additional direction on accessing information related to this document, see the "Accessing Information and Submitting Comments" section of this document.

South Carolina Electric and Gas Company, Docket Nos.: 52-027 and 52-028, Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station (VCSNS), Units 2 and 3, Fairfield County, South Carolina

Date of amendment request: February 27, 2014. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML14065A021.

Description of amendment request: The proposed change would amend Combined License Nos. NPF-93 and NPF-94 for VCSNS, Units 2 and 3, respectively, by revising Tier 2\* and associated Tier 2 information related to the construction of Module CA03. Some of these changes include the clarification of various materials in the design, increasing anchoring supports, and allowing the use of anchor bars with hooks.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The design functions of the nuclear island structures are to provide support, protection, and separation for the seismic Category I mechanical

and electrical equipment located in the nuclear island. The nuclear island structures are structurally designed to meet seismic Category I requirements as defined in Regulatory Guide 1.29 (ADAMS Accession No. ML070310052).

The change to the design details for the in-containment refueling water storage tank (IRWST) west wall does not have an adverse impact on the response of the nuclear island structures to safe shutdown earthquake ground motions or loads due to anticipated transients or postulated accident conditions, nor does it change the seismic Category I classification. The change to the design details for the IRWST west wall does not impact the support, design, or operation of mechanical and fluid systems. There is no change to plant systems or the response of systems to postulated accident conditions. There is no change to the predicted radioactive releases due to postulated accident conditions. The plant response to previously evaluated accidents or external events is not adversely affected, nor does the change described create any new accident precursors.

Therefore, the proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Does the proposed amendment create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed change is to revise design details for the IRWST west wall. The change of the design details for the IRWST west wall does not change the design requirements of the nuclear island structures, nor the seismic Category I classification. The change of the design details for the IRWST west wall does not change the design function, support, design, or operation of mechanical and fluid systems. The change of the design details for the IRWST west wall does not result in a new failure mechanism for the nuclear island structures or introduce any new accident precursors. As a result, the design function of the nuclear island structures is not adversely affected by the proposed change.

Therefore, the proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

No safety analysis or design basis acceptance limit/criterion is involved by the requested changes, thus, no margin of safety is reduced.

Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: Kathryn M. Sutton, Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLC, 1111 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20004-2514.

NRC Branch Chief: Lawrence J. Burkhart.

South Carolina Electric and Gas Company, Docket Nos. 52-027 and 52-028, Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station (VCSNS), Units 2 and 3, Fairfield County, South Carolina

Date of amendment request: April 3, 2014. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML14093B258.

Description of amendment request: The proposed change would amend Combined License Nos. NPF-93 and NPF-94 for the VCSNS, Units 2 and 3 by departing from the plant-specific Design Control Document (DCD) Tier 2\* to identify design details of the floors of the auxiliary building that may vary due to design and loading conditions, in accordance with code requirements.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The design functions of the auxiliary building floors are to provide support, protection, and separation for the seismic Category I mechanical and electrical equipment located in the auxiliary building. The auxiliary building is a seismic Category I structure and is designed for dead, live, thermal, pressure, safe shutdown earthquake loads, and loads due to postulated pipe breaks. The proposed changes to [Updated Final Safety Analysis Report] UFSAR descriptions and figures are intended to address changes in the detail design of floors in the auxiliary building. The proposed changes also incorporate requirements for development and anchoring of headed reinforcement. The properties of the concrete and reinforcement included in the auxiliary building structure are not altered. As a result, the design function of the auxiliary building structure is not adversely affected by the proposed changes. There is no change to plant systems or the response of systems to postulated accident conditions. There is no change to the predicted radioactive releases due to postulated accident conditions. The plant response to previously evaluated accidents or external events is not adversely affected, nor do the changes described create any new accident precursors.

Therefore, the proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Does the proposed amendment create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed changes to UFSAR descriptions and figures are proposed to address changes in the detail design of floors in the auxiliary building. The proposed changes also incorporate the requirements for development and anchoring of headed reinforcement which were previously approved. The thickness, geometry, and strength of the structures are not adversely altered. The concrete and reinforcement materials are not altered. The properties of the concrete are not altered. The changes to the design details of the auxiliary building structure do not create any new accident precursors. As a result, the design function of the auxiliary building structure is not adversely affected by the proposed changes.

Therefore, the proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

The criteria and requirements of American Concrete institute (ACI) 349 and American Institute of Steel Construction (AISC) N690 provide a margin of safety to structural failure. The design of the auxiliary building structure conforms to applicable criteria and requirements in ACI 349 and AISC N690 and therefore maintains the margin of safety. The proposed changes to the UFSAR address changes in the detail design of floors in the auxiliary building. The proposed changes also incorporate the requirements for development and anchoring of headed reinforcement which were previously approved. There is no change to design requirements of the auxiliary building structure. There is no change to the method of evaluation from that used in the design basis calculations. There is not a significant change to the in structure response spectra.

Therefore, the proposed amendment does not result in a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: Kathryn M. Sutton, Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLC, 1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20004-2514.

NRC Branch Chief: Lawrence Burkhart.

Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Docket Nos. 52-025 and 52-026, Vogtle Electric Generating Plant (VEGP), Units 3 and 4, Burke County, Georgia

Date of amendment request: April 4, 2014. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML14094A348.

Description of amendment request: The proposed change would amend Combined License Nos. NPF-91 and NPF-92 for the VEGP, Units 3 and 4 by departing from the plant-specific Design Control Document (DCD) Tier 2\* to identify design details of the floors of the auxiliary building that may vary due to design and loading conditions, in accordance with code requirements.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No

The design functions of the auxiliary building floors are to provide support, protection, and separation for the seismic Category I mechanical and electrical equipment located in the auxiliary building. The auxiliary building is a seismic Category I structure and is designed for dead, live, thermal, pressure, safe shutdown earthquake loads, and loads due to postulated pipe breaks. The proposed changes to [Updated Final Safety Analysis Report] UFSAR descriptions and figures are intended to address changes in the detail design of floors in the auxiliary building. The proposed changes also incorporate requirements for development and anchoring of headed reinforcement. The properties of the concrete and reinforcement included in the auxiliary building structure are not altered. As a result, the design function of the auxiliary building structure is not adversely affected by the proposed changes. There is no change to plant systems or the response of systems to postulated accident conditions. There is no change to the predicted radioactive releases due to postulated accident conditions. The plant response to previously evaluated accidents or external events is not adversely affected, nor do the changes described create any new accident precursors.

Therefore, the proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Does the proposed amendment create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.



The proposed changes to UFSAR descriptions and figures are proposed to address changes in the detail design of floors in the auxiliary building. The proposed changes also incorporate the requirements for development and anchoring of headed reinforcement which were previously approved. The thickness, geometry, and strength of the structures are not adversely altered. The concrete and reinforcement materials are not altered. The properties of the concrete are not altered. The changes to the design details of the auxiliary building structure do not create any new accident precursors. As a result, the design function of the auxiliary building structure is not adversely affected by the proposed changes.

Therefore, the proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

The criteria and requirements of American Concrete institute (ACI) 349 and American Institute of Steel Construction (AISC) N690 provide a margin of safety to structural failure. The design of the auxiliary building structure conforms to applicable criteria and requirements in ACI 349 and AISC N690 and therefore maintains the margin of safety. The proposed changes to the UFSAR address changes in the detail design of floors in the auxiliary building. The proposed changes also incorporate the requirements for development and anchoring of headed reinforcement which were previously approved. There is no change to design requirements of the auxiliary building structure. There is no change to the method of evaluation from that used in the design basis calculations. There is not a significant change to the in structure response spectra.

Therefore, the proposed amendment does not result in a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: M. Stanford Blanton, Blach & Bingham LLP, 1710 Sixth Avenue North, Birmingham, AL 35203-2015.

NRC Branch Chief: Lawrence J. Burkhart.

Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc., Docket Nos. 52-025 and 52-026, Vogtle Electric Generating Plant (VEGP), Units 3 and 4, Burke County, Georgia

Date of amendment request: March 17, 2014. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML14076A173.

Description of amendment request: The proposed change would amend Combined License Nos. NPF-91 and NPF-92 for the VEGP, Units 3 and 4. The requested amendment proposes changes to revise the VEGP Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) by clarifying how human diversity was applied during the design process for the Component Interface Module (CIM) and Diverse Actuation System (DAS). This license amendment request (LAR) proposes the addition of Appendix 7A to VEGP, Units 3 and 4 UFSAR Chapter 7 to modify information related to human diversity, as presented in a Tier 2\* document, WCAP-17179-NP, "AP1000 Component Interface Module Technical Report," Revision 2 (ADAMS Accession No. ML102170259), and two Tier 2 documents, WCAP-15775, "AP1000 Instrumentation and Control Defense-in-Depth and Diversity Report," Revision 4 (ADAMS Accession No. ML101530048) and WCAP-17184-NP, "AP1000 Diverse Actuation System Planning and Functional Design Summary Technical Report," Revision 2 (ADAMS Accession No. ML102170263) that are incorporated by reference in the VEGP, Units 3 and 4 UFSAR.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR

50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The requested amendment proposes changes to licensing basis documents to clarify the position on the human diversity aspects of design diversity as related to the Component Interface Module (CIM) and Diverse Actuation System (DAS) design processes. A review confirmed that the clarified position on human diversity would not change the CIM or DAS design. The requested changes to information presented in the Tier 2\* and Tier 2 supporting documentation clarify the level of human diversity applied. The change continues to comply with the regulatory guidance in NUREG/CR-6303 ["Method for Performing Diversity and Defense-in-Depth Analyses of Reactor Protection Systems," (ADAMS Accession No. ML071790509)] regarding credible defenses against a postulated Common Cause Failure (CCF) of the Plant Monitoring and Safety System. The proposed change does not affect the plant itself. The change does not affect prevention and mitigation of abnormal events, e.g., accidents, anticipated operational occurrences, earthquakes, floods and turbine missiles, or their safety or design analyses. No safety-related structure, system, or component (SSC) or function is adversely affected. The change does not involve nor interface with any SSC accident initiator or initiating sequence of events, and thus, the probabilities of the accidents evaluated in the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) are not affected. This activity will not allow for a new fission product release path, nor will it result in a new fission product barrier failure mode, nor create a new sequence of events that would result in significant fuel cladding failures. Because the proposed changes do not change any safety related SSC or function credited in the mitigation of an accident, the consequences of the accidents evaluated in the UFSAR are not affected.

Therefore, the proposed amendment does not involve an increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Does the proposed amendment create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed changes clarify the position on human diversity and show that the CIM/DAS diversity meets the regulatory guidance in NUREG/CR-6303. The clarified descriptions do not affect the plant itself. Therefore, the proposed changes do not affect any safety-related equipment itself, nor do they affect equipment whose failure could initiate an accident or a failure of a fission product barrier. No analysis is adversely affected by the proposed changes. No system or design function or equipment qualification would be adversely affected by the proposed changes. Furthermore, the proposed changes do not result in a new failure mode, malfunction or sequence of events that could affect safety or safety-related equipment.

Therefore, the proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident.

3. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

The proposed changes to information presented in referenced licensing basis documents clarify the position regarding human diversity and do not affect the plant itself. The proposed changes do not adversely affect the design, construction, or operation of any plant SSCs, including any equipment whose failure could initiate an accident or a failure of a fission product barrier. No analysis is adversely affected by the proposed changes. Furthermore, no system function, design function, or equipment qualification will be adversely affected by the changes.

Therefore, the proposed amendment does not reduce the margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: M. Stanford Blanton, Balch & Bingham LLP, 1710 Sixth Avenue North, Birmingham, AL 35203-2015.

NRC Branch Chief: Lawrence J. Burkhart.

### **III. Notice of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses and Combined Licenses**

During the period since publication of the last biweekly notice, the Commission has issued the following amendments. The Commission has determined for each of these amendments that the application complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations. The Commission has made appropriate findings as required by the Act and the Commission's rules and regulations in 10 CFR Chapter I, which are set forth in the license amendment.

A notice of consideration of issuance of amendment to facility operating license or combined license, as applicable, proposed no significant hazards consideration determination, and opportunity for a hearing in connection with these actions, was published in the *Federal Register* as indicated.

Unless otherwise indicated, the Commission has determined that these amendments satisfy the criteria for categorical exclusion in accordance with 10 CFR 51.22. Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared for these amendments. If the Commission has prepared an environmental assessment under the special circumstances provision in 10 CFR 51.22(b) and has made a determination based on that assessment, it is so indicated.

For further details with respect to the action see (1) the applications for amendment, (2) the amendment, and (3) the Commission's related letter, Safety Evaluation and/or Environmental Assessment as indicated. All of these items can be accessed as described in the "Accessing Information and Submitting Comments" section of this document.

Dominion Nuclear Connecticut, Inc., et al., Docket No. 50-423, Millstone Power Station, Unit 3, New London County, Connecticut

Date of application for amendment: April 25, 2013, as supplemented by letters dated September 19, and December 11, 2013.

Brief description of amendment: The Amendment revises the Technical Specifications Section 6.8.4.f, "Containment Leakage Rate Testing Program" to increase the value of the calculated peak containment internal pressure,  $P_a$ , from 41.4 pounds per square inch gage (psig) to 41.9 psig. This increase is needed to address an increase in the calculated mass and energy (M&E) release during the blowdown phase of the design basis Loss-of-Coolant Accident (LOCA).

Date of issuance: April 8, 2014.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented within 60 days from the date of issuance.

Amendment No.: 259. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML14073A055; documents related to this amendment are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendment.

Renewed Facility Operating License No. NPF-49: Amendment revised the License and Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: June 25, 2013 (78 FR 38081). The supplements dated September 19 and December 11, 2013, provided additional information that clarified the application, did not expand the scope of the application as originally noticed, and did not change the staff's original proposed no significant hazards consideration determination as published in the *Federal Register*.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 8, 2014.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc., Docket No. 50-333, James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant, Oswego County, New York

Date of amendment request: June 7, 2012.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment adopts the NRC's-approved Technical Specifications Task Force (TSTF) Standard Technical Specifications Change Traveler TSTF-535, "Revise Shutdown Margin Definition to Address Advanced Fuel Designs," ADAMS Accession No. ML112200436 dated August 8, 2011; to modify the TS definition of "Shutdown Margin" (SDM).

The change requires the calculation of the SDM at a reactor moderator temperature of 68 °F or higher, to a temperature that represents the most reactive state of the core throughout the reactor operating cycle. This change is needed to address new Boiling Water Reactor fuel designs which may be more reactive at shutdown temperatures above 68 °F.

Date of issuance: April 14, 2014.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance, and shall be implemented within 60 days.

Amendment No.: 305. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML14085A446; documents related to this amendment are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendment.

Renewed Facility Operating License No. DPR-59: The amendment revised the License and the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: November 26, 2013 (78 FR 70592).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 14, 2014.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket No. 50-390, Watts Bar Nuclear Plant, Unit 1, Rhea County, Tennessee

Date of application for amendment: April 12, 2013.

Description of amendment request: The amendment revised Technical Specification (TS) 5.9.2, "Annual Radiological Environmental Operating Report," to delete the reference to collocated dosimeters in relation to the NRC thermoluminescent dosimeters program. This change is consistent with the NRC's-approved Technical Specification Task Force (TSTF) change TSTF-348. In addition, it would correct a cross-reference error in TS 5.9.8, "PAMS Post Accident Monitoring System Report."

Date of issuance: April 7, 2014.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented no later than 30 days from date of issuance.

Amendment No.: 96. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML14071A339; documents related to this amendment are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendment.

Facility Operating License No. NPF-90: Amendment revised the License and TSs.

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: August 20, 2013 (78 FR 51230).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 7, 2014.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: None.



Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket No. 50-390, Watts Bar Nuclear Plant, Unit 1, Rhea County, Tennessee

Date of application for amendment: July 30, 2013.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revised Technical Specification (TS) 4.3.1.1, "Criticality," to clarify the requirements for storage of new and spent fuel assemblies in the spent fuel racks. This change updated the current Unit 1 TS to ensure consistency with the proposed TS 4.3.1.1 for Unit 2. In addition, editorial changes are being made to TS 4.3.1.

Date of issuance: April 7, 2014.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented no later than 60 days from date of issuance.

Amendment No.: 95. A publicly-available version is in ADAMS under Accession No. ML14071A290; documents related to this amendment are listed in the Safety Evaluation enclosed with the amendment.

Facility Operating License No. NPF-90: Amendment revised the License and TSs.

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: December 10, 2013 (78 FR 74185).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated April 7, 2014.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: None.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 18th day of April 2014.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

A. Louise Lund, Deputy Director,  
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing,  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 2014-09489 Filed 04/28/2014 at 8:45 am; Publication Date: 04/29/2014]